Interview Summary

Application No. 09/755.734

Anne Marie S. Beckerleg

Applicant(s)

Podsakoff Group Art Unit 1632

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Anne Marie S. Beckerleg

(2) Ken Chanine

Oct 11, 2001

(4)

b) Video Conference

Identification of prior art discussed:

Type: a) Telephonic

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

112, hot paraposh, discussed submitting the 132 data from
the parent and new data reparches to trenspends delucing to
miscular proteins.
The regards to the new matheriseder in "Internation"
in chief, if was supposed that the applicant strong in
organization one supposed that the applicant strong in
organization one supposed expected implicit, for majorised.
It with motion process a primate control in the modest self with
Congress indicated delays as objected for the intervences.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.